

Appl. No. 10/002,882
Amdt. Dated June 30,2006,
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2006

APP 1316

Remarks

Claims 26, 27, 31, 32, and 40 remain in the application.

Claims 33, 41, and 42 are canceled by this amendment and have been incorporated into independent Claim 40. The claims remaining in the application have been amended to clean up the language.

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 42 is canceled and hence, the rejection is rendered moot.

The claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giloi et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,985) and further in view of Ganesan (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,419). Claim 40 as amended includes the limitation previously found in Claim 33, namely that a communication controller creates a persistent conference where the conference server retains identification of the persistent conference after users to the persistent conference leave the persistent conference. It is respectfully submitted that the art of record fails to teach or even suggest such a step.

Gilio at column 7, lines 6 to 7, says that the database permits a view of the current participants in the conference. There is no disclosure of retaining the identification of a persistent conference after users to the conference leave the conference as claimed by Applicants. Column 14, lines 52 to column 15 line 20 is silent with regard to persistent conferences and retaining the identification of the persistent conference after users to the persistent conference leave the persistent conference as claimed by Applicants.

Appl. No. 10/002,882
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006,
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2006

APP 1316

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 40 as currently amended is neither taught nor even suggested by the art of record and hence, Claim 40 should be deemed allowable over the art of record.

Claims 26, 27, 31 and 32 are dependent upon Claim 40 or dependent upon a claim which is dependent upon Claim 40. Since for the reasons as noted above Claim 40 should be deemed allowable, it is likewise submitted that Claims 26, 27, 31 and 32 should be allowable over the art of record.

Reexamination, reconsideration and favorable action regarding Claims 26, 27, 31, 32, and 40 are respectfully requested.

Authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account No. 02-1822 the fee due under 37 CFR 1.17(a) of \$120.00 for a one month extension of the time to reply to the Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Philip J. Feig
Reg. No. 27,328
Tel. No. 732-699-7997